

# MEETING SUMMARY

## Eisenhower West Small Area Plan Steering Committee Meeting #2

Tuesday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2014 | 6:30- 8:30 pm | Cameron Station Clubhouse

### 1 Steering Committee Members Present

- Judy Coleman, Alexandria Park and Recreation Commission
- Sam Gaugush, Alexandria Environmental Policy Commission
- Michael Adams, Community Representative
- Don Buch, Community Representative
- Jim Durham, Community Representative
- David Heiden, Business Representative
- Janet Gregor (in place of Agnés Artemel), Business Representative
- Mary Catherine Gibbs, Business Representative
- Ken Wire, Landowner Group Representative

### 2 City Staff Present

- Susan Eddy, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Radhika Mohan, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Ryan Price, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Richard Lawrence, Department of Planning and Zoning
- Richard Baier, Department of Transportation and Environmental Services
- Steve Sindiong, Department of Transportation and Environmental Services
- Jim Spengler, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
- Mark Jinks, City Manager's Office
- Jerome Fletcher, City Manager's Office

### 3 Welcome and Introductions

- Susan Eddy, Deputy Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning, and Rich Baier, Director of Transportation and Environmental Services, introduced themselves, city staff, and welcomed attendees.
- To introduce attendees, staff lead a group activity.
- Staff reviewed the small area plan and civic engagement processes, meeting agenda, and highlights from Steering Committee Meeting #1.

### 4 Election of Vice Chair

- Robert's Rules of Order were used to elect the Vice Chair of the Steering Committee.
- Agnés Artemel, Don Buch, and Judy Coleman were nominated.
- Don Buch declined the nomination.
- Judy Coleman was unanimously elected Vice Chair.

### **Staff Presentation**

*Staff continued with a presentation on the small area plan boundary, the first online survey results, and combined work program and meeting schedule. The following is a summary of the discussion on each of these presentation topics.*

### 5 Small Area Plan Boundary Discussion

- General Questions

- Is the City at risk of losing funding because of the extended timeline? No, funding will not be terminated. Payment of consultants will start when they begin work. The MOU does not list a specific start date but lists an end date of July 2015 for consultant work (not staff work) to be completed. The MOU also states that the process will take 18 months which gives room for flexibility in the timeline, especially given that this plan will focus on general planning guidance and not specific design guidelines.
- How will the existing overlay plan work with this plan? The Landmark/Van Dorn Corridor (LMVDC) Plan recommendations can be absorbed into the new plan where they overlap geographically and remain as an overlay where the LMVDC Plan does not overlap.
- What level of detail on the multimodal bridge does the transportation study include? It will include selecting the preferred alignment and section of the multimodal bridge. It was noted that the dashed line on the presentation transportation map is not the actual alignment of the bridge, which will be part of the study.
- What modes does multimodal include? "Multimodal" implies multiple uses, not singular uses, and the modes have not been identified.
- Will the transportation study look at bike share and bike lanes? Bike lanes and bike share stations will be studied under the Bike/Ped Master Plan Study currently underway.
- How will traffic be accounted for? The transportation study TDM model (Traffic Demand Management) will differentiate local traffic versus thru traffic and will take into account increased traffic from the new residential projects along Van Dorn.
- General Comments
  - We should not leave holes in planning areas when determining small area plan (SAP) boundaries.
  - The SAP boundary should examine how it fits in to the entire city and be visionary.
  - SAPs can plan to preserve areas too and not just plan for redevelopment. If there is no need for change in an area, that is not a reason to exclude properties from the SAP.
  - Increasing the boundary area will increase the scope of work and time needed for the planning process.
  - If the SAP boundary expands then the transportation study boundary will have to expand as well.
  - If there is little appetite to change something, then do not include it in the study area.
  - Consider the impacts of areas just outside the planning area.
  - Keep the boundary the same as the original Landmark/Van Dorn Plan from 1992.
  - The SAP boundary should not be dictated by the transportation study boundary.
  - The transportation study boundary should stay the same as the 1993 transportation study boundary.
  - If properties are not included in the plan boundary, then the property will experience no change.
- Extending the Boundary East to Telegraph Road
  - This includes the VDOT parcel, Townes of Cameron Park, Cameron Run Regional Park, the WMATA site, the animal shelter, and hotel.
  - This area is affected by environmental issues such as flooding, and if included the plan could address this issue more holistically.

- If extending the boundary east involves including more absentee landlords in the SAP then it will be difficult to implement the plan.
- Extending the boundary will include properties of a different character.
- Properties further east on Eisenhower Avenue relate more to Eisenhower West than to Seminary Hill and will be affected by the multimodal bridge.
- Do not include sensitive uses like the park and animal shelter that do not need to change.
- The plan boundary should be thought of as broader than Cameron Station and Eisenhower West- think of the traffic, businesses, and people generated by the NSF that could affect this area.
- If we do not include the area extending to Telegraph Road now, then when will it get planned?
- The area east could experience development pressures due to proximity to the metro station.
- If study area expands, then transportation improvements on Duke Street should increase.
- Extending the boundary east will not have as much impact, because there are not as many developable properties.
- Western Boundary (City limits):
  - All were in agreement.
- Northern Boundary
  - If Cameron Station is included, it should not be up for redevelopment.
  - Possible redevelopment along Van Dorn Street towards Landmark Mall will have a big impact on roads and schools in relation to capacity, so it makes sense to include them.
  - Include Pickett Street within the plan boundary.
  - Move the boundary north to Reynolds and Edsall Streets, which is not included in the Landmark/Van Dorn Corridor Plan.
- Motions
  - A motion was made to keep the staff boundary.
  - A second, alternate motion was made to extend the plan boundary east to Telegraph Road south of the railroad tracks.
  - A motion to accept the alternate motion was passed.
  - The alternate motion passed with the recommendation that it be a high level planning study. This motion stands as the boundary recommended to staff by the Eisenhower West Steering Committee.

## 6 First Online Survey Results

- For the next survey, include a question on the number per household to get a general sense of how many households have children.
- Ask a question on how people get to work and what modes of transit they use.
- Provide the basic demographics of the area and how they compare to the survey results.

## 7 Combined Work Program, RFP Updates, and Schedule

- The Steering Committee approved holding meetings in July and agreed to a June 30<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting.
- Meeting more frequently was requested as a way to speed up the planning process.
- The Steering Committee requested to review the description of their boundary recommended to staff.